



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/629,696	08/01/2000	Yee S. Ng	80097JDL	7637

7590 06/29/2005

Richard A Romanchik
NexPress Digital LLC
2600 Manitou Road
Rochester, NY 14624

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, JAMES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/629,696	NG ET AL	
Examiner	Art Unit	
James A. Thompson	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2005 and 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/4/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 23 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding page 2, lines 4-20: In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation is clearly given in Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301), specifically in column 5, lines 20-22 of Yamaguchi (page 4, lines 11-14 of the previous office action, dated 14 December 2004), and not column 5, lines 11-20 of Yamaguchi, as Applicant has accidentally misquoted in the present arguments (page 2, lines 7-8 of present arguments). Further, the mere use of color-separated RIP data, as taught by Yamaguchi, instead of grayscale data, as taught by Lin (US Patent 5,742,703), is a trivial modification in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would easily be able to modify the system taught by Lin to use color-separated RIP data, as taught by Yamaguchi. Using color-separated RIP data would allow one of ordinary skill in the art to perform real-time layout editing (column 5, lines 20-22 of Yamaguchi), which is clearly a desirable benefit.

Art Unit: 2624

Additionally, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). As demonstrated above, the motivation to combine the references comes from both a direct quote from the Yamaguchi reference and from what would have been common knowledge to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding page 2, line 21 to page 3, line 17: Applicant is referring to a different portion of the operations of the system taught by Yamaguchi. In said previous office action, Examiner cited column 5, lines 20-22 of Yamaguchi to teach the motivation to combine (page 4, lines 11-14 of said previous office action). The cited passage states: "a lay[o]ut controller 750 for performing real-time layout editing when outputting data to the printer unit 300." Later, in reference to said layout controller, Yamaguchi states:

"Then, the main controller 210 transfers the image data portion within the received image-data packet to the raster-image memory 760. The transferred image data is controlled by being stored in a plurality of divided portions of the raster-image memory 760 in the form of an image file, and is registered in the raster-image memory 760 based on information registered in the position/attribute-information table 770 corresponding to the above-described image-file ID, such as the start address in

Art Unit: 2624

the memory, the length and the attribute of the image data, position information of layout output of the image data, and the like (step 26).

After registering all of the image data packets, the main controller 210 sets the number of prints and layout information provided in the position/attribute-information table in the layout controller 750. The layout controller 750 performs magnification/reduction/modified editing at the assigned position with the assigned size, and transfers the obtained raster-image data to the printer unit 300 via the digital-interface controller 790, and the printer unit 300 outputs a corresponding printed image (step 27)."
[column 10, line 61 to column 11, line 4 of Yamaguchi]

The RIP data in the raster-image memory 760 is transferred to the layout controller 750 after the main controller 210 sets the number of prints and the layout information. Then, the layout controller 750 performs the editing operation of magnification, reduction and/or modification. The modified raster data is then sent straight to the printer. Thus, Yamaguchi does indeed teach that rasterized data is edited.

Regarding page 3, line 19 to page 5, line 8: Again, in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Applicant's arguments with regard to allegations of hindsight reasoning have been rebutted in detail above and are

Art Unit: 2624

applicable to Applicant's arguments with regard to the other claims discussed on page 3, line 19 to page 5, line 8 of the present arguments.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Information Disclosure Statement submitted 04 April 2005 is defective. A reference is given as US Patent 4,1489,194 to Holladay. Clearly no such patent exists since the form of the number is improper. Examiner believes Applicant is referring to US Patent 4,149,194 which was granted to Holladay and the reference is a simple typographical error. An Information Disclosure Statement properly referencing the patent intended by the applicant is required in order for the intended patent to be properly considered and placed as part of the official record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (US Patent 5,742,703) in view of Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301).

Regarding claim 1: Lin discloses a method for processing image data comprising providing gray level image data (column 6,

Art Unit: 2624

lines 56-58 of Lin); subjecting the gray level image data to halftone screen processing to form halftone processed screen image data (column 8, lines 25-27 of Lin); and analyzing a current pixel of the halftone processed screen image data to a test criterion to determine if the current pixel is a possible saturated color text image (column 7, lines 14-18 and lines 24-27 of Lin). Grayscale values are stored and processed in parallel by two different halftone processors, namely channel A and channel B (column 7, lines 2-9 of Lin). Channel A thresholds the grayscale values (column 7, lines 16-18 of Lin) for data that is saturated or nearly saturated in order to distinguish regions of the image that are text or line art (column 7, lines 24-27 of Lin).

Lin further discloses that, if the current pixel meets the criterion for being a pixel of a possible saturated color text image, the gray level image enhanced processing modification of the current pixel for output to a printer or display is selected (figure 2(80,86,88) and column 8, lines 40-46 of Lin). Buffer 1 (figure 2(80) of Lin) stores the halftoned data from channel A (column 8, lines 21-23 of Lin). The halftoned data from channel A undergoes pattern matching (column 7, lines 47-55 of Lin), which is used so that said halftone data can undergo high-addressability gray-scale or sub-pixel processing (figures 4a-4d and column 8, lines 1-6 and lines 10-14 of Lin). If the image data at the point that is being output is tagged as text or line art, then the data from buffer 1 is output (column 8, lines 40-46 of Lin).

Lin further discloses that, if the current pixel does not meet the test criterion for being a pixel of a possible saturated color text image selecting the current pixel gray

Art Unit: 2624

level value as processed by the halftone screen processing for output to a printer or display (figure 2(80,86,88) and column 8, lines 40-47 of Lin). Buffer 2 (figure 2(86) of Lin) stores the halftoned data from channel B, which is the grayscale image data (column 8, lines 38-40 of Lin). If the image data at the point that is being output is not tagged as text or line art, then the data from buffer 2 is output (column 8, lines 40-47 of Lin).

Lin does not disclose expressly that the image data provided is rasterized color separated contone gray level image data (RIP Data).

Yamaguchi discloses providing rasterized color separated contone gray level image data (RIP Data) (column 5, lines 11-20 of Yamaguchi).

Lin and Yamaguchi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftoning and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use rasterized color separated gray level image data as the input data provided. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to perform real-time layout editing of printer output data (column 5, lines 20-22 of Yamaguchi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamaguchi with Lin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 8: Lin discloses that, in gray level enhanced processing, a binary image file is modified with gray level pixels of a density less than maximum density (figures 4a-4d and column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin). Channel A binarizes the image (column 7, lines 14-18 of Lin). The binarized data is then processed to create gray-scale or sub-pixel image signals (figures 4a-4d and column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin). Said processing

Art Unit: 2624

is performed in order to render the image in an acceptable manner (column 8, lines 2-3 of Lin), which means that artifacts such as jaggedness are removed and smooth edge transitions are provided (figure 7; figure 8 and column 11, lines 39-43 and lines 52-55 of Lin).

5. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (US Patent 5,742,703) in view of Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301) and Mongeon (US Patent 5,710,824).

Regarding claim 10: Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that said rasterized image data is adjusted for color saturation according to personal preference.

Mongeon discloses that the image data is adjusted for color saturation (column 6, lines 32-37 of Mongeon) according to a personal preference (column 1, lines 3-7 and column 6, lines 35-37 of Mongeon). The color gamut of image data is adjusted based on the aesthetic appearance of an image (column 1, lines 3-7 and column 6, lines 35-37 of Mongeon), which would inherently relate to personal preference. Adjustment of the color gamut of an image includes the adjustment of the image data based on color saturation (column 6, lines 32-37 of Mongeon).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Mongeon because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the processing of image data for printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the image data for color saturation according to a personal preference. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve the aesthetic appearance of the image (column 1, lines 5-7 of Mongeon). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2624

combine Mongeon with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (US Patent 5,742,703) in view of Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301), Mongeon (US Patent 5,710,824) and Tai (US Patent 5,694,224).

Regarding claim 11: Lin in view of Yamaguchi and Mongeon discloses that the image data is adjusted for color saturation according to personal preference, as discussed in the arguments regarding claim 10, which are incorporated herein.

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that the image data is analyzed for contrast and in response to analysis for contrast blending coefficients are generated and the image data that is adjusted for color saturation is independently subjected to separate halftone screen processing with screens of different halftone frequencies and outputs of the processing by the different halftone screen processings are each modified by a respective blending coefficients.

Tai discloses that the image data is analyzed for contrast (column 9, lines 11-15 of Tai). In response to analysis for contrast, blending coefficients are generated (column 10, lines 28-34 of Tai). Said image data is independently subjected to separate halftone screen processing (column 8, line 56 to column 9, line 10 of Tai). The screens have different halftone frequencies (column 8; lines 56-57, lines 59-60 and lines 63-64; and column 9, lines 4-5 of Tai). The outputs of the processing by the different halftone screen processings are each modified by a respective blending coefficients (column 10, lines 26-30 of Tai).

Art Unit: 2624

Lin in view of Yamaguchi and Mongeon is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to take the halftone data processed by the halftone processor of Lin (figure 2(84) of Lin) and process said halftone data based on the level of contrast calculated. Then, said halftone data is processed by a plurality of different halftone screens based on said level of contrast and blended before being output. The motivation for doing so would have been to print halftone dots in a manner appropriate to the level of contrast of the data (column 8; lines 58-59, lines 62-63 and lines 65-66; and column 9, lines 9-10 of Tai) and to prevent unnatural appearances in the image (column 8, lines 35-36 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi and Mongeon to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (US Patent 5,742,703) in view of Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301) and Yoshiaki (US Patent 5,574,833).

Regarding claim 12: Lin discloses smoothing edges using higher resolution image data (figures 4a-4d and column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that the resolution enhancement processor is adjustable to provide for different levels of smoothing of edges.

Yoshiaki discloses that the resolution enhancement used for smoothing edges is adjustable (figures 4a-4f and column 3, lines 3-12 of Yoshiaki), thus providing different levels of smoothing

Art Unit: 2624

of edges (column 3, lines 1-3 of Yoshiaki). The level of enhancement is adjusted based on the resolution of the input image, in this case a fax machine image, and the resolution of the output image, in this case a printer image (column 3, lines 3-12 of Yoshiaki). Therefore, the enhancement can be made by the selection of the fax machine, the selection of the printer, and the selection of the resolution of the printer if said printer can print in more than one resolution.

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Yoshiaki because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftoning and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make the resolution enhancement adjustable to provide for different levels of smoothing of edges. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to provide smooth edges when the input data provided is of one resolution and the output data desired is of another resolution (column 4, lines 52-55 of Yoshiaki). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yoshiaki with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

8. Claims 2-7, 11, 13-15, 19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (US Patent 5,742,703) in view of Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301) and Tai (US Patent 5,694,224).

Regarding claim 2: Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that the gray level image data is processed independently through plural halftone screen processors and the output of the two processors are blended.

Art Unit: 2624

Tai discloses that the gray level image data is processed independently through plural halftone screen processors (column 8, line 56 to column 9, line 11 of Tai) and the output of the two processors are blended (column 10, lines 26-30 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to process the gray level image data using plural halftone screen processors and then blending two of said processors. The motivation for doing so would have been to print halftone dots in a manner appropriate to the level of contrast of the data (column 8; lines 58-59, lines 62-63 and lines 65-66; and column 9, lines 9-10 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Regarding claim 3: Lin discloses that in the step of analyzing, the current pixel and plural neighboring pixels to the current pixel are examined relative to a threshold (column 7, lines 20-27 and column 8, lines 10-14 of Lin). Each pixel is examined relative to a threshold value that determines whether or not a pixel is in saturation, and therefore either text or line art (column 7, lines 20-27 of Lin). A pixel with plural neighboring pixels is used in determining if a particular pattern exists for the purpose of determining a higher resolution sub-pixel image signal (figures 4a-4d and column 8, lines 10-14 of Lin).

Regarding claim 13: Lin discloses a method for processing image data comprising providing gray level image data (column 6, lines 56-58 of Lin); and comparing the gray level of the

Art Unit: 2624

halftone screen processed current pixel relative to a threshold criterion (column 7, lines 16-20 and column 8, lines 27-30 of Lin).

Lin further discloses that, if the gray level of the blended halftone screen processed current pixel meets said threshold criterion (column 7, lines 16-18 of Lin), then a gray level image enhanced processing modification of the current pixel (column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin) is provided for output to a printer or display (column 8, lines 42-47 of Lin).

Lin further discloses that, if the gray level of the blended halftone screen processed current pixel does not meet said threshold criterion (column 7, lines 16-18 of Lin), then the current pixel gray level as processed by the halftone screen processing is provided for output to a printer or display (column 8, lines 40-47 of Lin).

Lin does not disclose expressly that the image data provided is rasterized color separated contone gray level image data (RIP Data); subjecting first gray level image data to plural separate halftone screen processings to form plural separate halftone screen processed gray level image data; analyzing a current pixel of the first gray level image data for contrast index; in response to the analyzing, generating blending coefficients for processing that current pixel; and processing the plural separate halftone screen processed image data with the blending coefficients to blend halftone screen processed gray level image data of the same current pixel to form a blended halftone screen processed gray level current pixel.

Art Unit: 2624

Yamaguchi discloses providing rasterized color separated contone gray level image data (RIP Data) (column 5, lines 11-20 of Yamaguchi).

Lin and Yamaguchi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftoning and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use rasterized color separated gray level image data as the input data provided. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to perform real-time layout editing of printer output data (column 5, lines 20-22 of Yamaguchi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamaguchi with Lin.

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly subjecting first gray level image data to plural separate halftone screen processings to form plural separate halftone screen processed gray level image data; analyzing a current pixel of the first gray level image data for contrast index; in response to the analyzing, generating blending coefficients for processing that current pixel; and processing the plural separate halftone screen processed image data with the blending coefficients to blend halftone screen processed gray level image data of the same current pixel to form a blended halftone screen processed gray level current pixel.

Tai discloses subjecting first gray level image data to plural separate halftone screen processings to form plural separate halftone screen processed gray level image data (column 8, line 56 to column 9, line 11 of Tai); analyzing a current pixel of the first gray level image data for contrast index (column 9, lines 12-15 of Tai); in response to the analyzing, generating blending coefficients for processing that current

Art. Unit: 2624

pixel (column 10, lines 28-34 of Tai); and processing the plural separate halftone screen processed image data with the blending coefficients (column 10, lines 26-37 of Tai) to blend halftone screen processed gray level image data of the same current pixel to form a blended halftone screen processed gray level current pixel (column 10, lines 37-39 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to process RIP Data at the halftone processor (figure 2(84) of Lin), as taught by Lin in view of Yamaguchi, with plural halftone screens, compute a contrast index for each pixel, generate respective blending coefficients, and then blend the halftone screens accordingly, as taught by Tai. The motivation for doing so would have been that halftone screen blending reduces printing artifacts (column 10, lines 57-63 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Regarding claim 14: Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that, in the step of determining if the gray level of the blended halftone screen processed current pixel meets the threshold criterion, there are also examined gray levels of blended halftone screen processed neighboring pixels to the current pixel.

Tai discloses that gray levels of blended halftone screen processed neighboring pixels to the current pixel are also examined (column 9, lines 12-19 of Tai) in the step of determining if the gray level of the blended halftone screen

Art Unit: 2624

processed current pixel meets the threshold criterion (column 9, lines 39-45 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to examine the neighboring pixels of the current pixel being examined in the step of determining if the gray level of the blended halftone screen processed current pixel meets the threshold criterion. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine which halftone screens are to be blended (column 9, lines 39-45 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Regarding claims 4 and 15: Lin discloses that the threshold value is a variable that is determined for use in the binarizing block (figure 2(72) of Lin). It is preferred that the threshold value is set to about 95% of the maximum value (column 7, lines 24-26 of Lin). However, this is done for the purpose of making sure that the continuous-tone portions of the image are not inadvertently mistaken for text or line art (column 7, lines 26-27 of Lin). Since the range of the desired threshold is variable (column 7, lines 24-27 of Lin), the threshold is an input variable to the binarizing block (figure 2 (T,72) and column 7, lines 18-21 of Lin), and the quality and characteristics of different images are inherently variable, then the threshold is adjustable.

Regarding claim 5: Lin discloses that one of the screen processors has a screen frequency of at least 200 lines per inch (column 10, lines 38-45 of Lin).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 6: Lin discloses that a current pixel meeting the criterion of being a saturated color text image has its gray level value adjusted to a maximum value (column 7, lines 16-20 and lines 24-27 of Lin). When the current pixel is processed by channel A, the grayscale value of said current pixel is thresholded (column 7, lines 16-20 of Lin). Then, said current pixel saved as a single bit (column 7, lines 28-32 of Lin), which means that it is set to either on or off. Setting said current pixel to either on or off essentially the same as setting an 8-bit grayscale value to either 0 or 255, especially since the single bit value determines whether the entire pixel is either all black or all white. Therefore, if the grayscale value of said current pixel is above the threshold value, then said current pixel is adjusted to the maximum value. The thresholding operation is performed prior to gray level enhancement processing (figure 2(74,78) of Lin). In figure 2 of Lin, the binarization (figure 2(72) of Lin) occurs before the pattern matching (figure 2(78) of Lin). The pattern matching block involves in part the rendering of grayscale or sub-pixel image signals (column 7, lines 38-44 and column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin), which is essentially gray level enhanced processing.

Regarding claim 7: The arguments regarding claim 8 are incorporated herein. A binary image file is inherently a substantially binary image file.

Regarding claim 19: The arguments regarding claim 8 are incorporated herein. A binary image is inherently a substantially binary image.

Regarding claim 21: Lin discloses a method for processing image data comprising providing gray level image data (column 6, lines 56-58 of Lin); halftone screening of the input grayscale

Art Unit: 2624

image data (column 8, lines 24-27 of Lin); and, if the halftone screen processed gray level value current pixel is substantially a maximum density pixel or is adjusted to be a substantially maximum density pixel (column 7, lines 24-27 of Lin), then said pixel is subjected to a gray level image enhanced processing modification (figures 4a-4d; column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin) to reduce jaggedness in an image (column 11, lines 43-55 of Lin). If the grayscale value of a pixel is above a threshold value, preferably about 95% of maximum, then said pixel is binarized as fully black (column 7, lines 24-29 of Lin), thus setting said pixel to the maximum value. If said pixel is set to the maximum value, then said pixel is modified as a grayscale or sub-pixel image (column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin). Said pixel is thus adjusted for the purpose of smoothing jagged edges (column 11, lines 43-55 of Lin).

Lin does not disclose expressly that the image data provided is rasterized color separated contone gray level image data (RIP Data); subjecting first gray level image data to plural separate halftone screen processings to form plural separate halftone screen processed gray level image data; and blending halftone screen processed gray level image data of the same current pixel to form a blended halftone screen processed gray level value current pixel.

Yamaguchi discloses providing rasterized color separated contone gray level image data (RIP Data) (column 5, lines 11-20 of Yamaguchi).

Lin and Yamaguchi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftoning and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use rasterized color

Art Unit: 2624

separated gray level image data as the input data provided. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to perform real-time layout editing of printer output data (column 5, lines 20-22 of Yamaguchi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamaguchi with Lin.

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly subjecting first gray level image data to plural separate halftone screen processings to form plural separate halftone screen processed gray level image data; and blending halftone screen processed gray level image data of the same current pixel to form a blended halftone screen processed gray level value current pixel.

Tai discloses subjecting first gray level image data to plural separate halftone screen processings to form plural separate halftone screen processed gray level image data (column 8, line 56 to column 9, line 11 of Tai); and blending halftone screen processed gray level image data of the same current pixel (column 10, lines 28-34 of Tai) to form a blended halftone screen processed gray level value current pixel (column 10, lines 34-39 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use plural separate halftone screens to halftone process the RIP Data and then blend the results of the plural halftone screens to obtain the resultant blended grayscale pixels. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to process an image with multiple types of image regions (column 10, lines 57-60 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Art Unit: 2624

Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 21.

Regarding claim 22: Lin discloses plural halftone screen processings (figure 2(72,84) and column 7, lines 14-16 of Lin).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that said plural halftone screen processings include a halftone screen processing employing a partial dot growth pattern and a halftone screen processing employing a mix dot growth pattern.

Tai discloses a halftone screen processing employing a partial dot growth pattern (column 8, lines 63-66 of Tai) and a halftone screen processing employing a mix dot growth pattern (column 8, lines 56-59 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a partial dot growth pattern for one of the halftone screens and a mixed dot growth pattern for the other halftone screen. The motivation for doing so would have been to take advantage of the different tonal characteristics and texture patterns of the partial and the mixed dot growth patterns (column 6, lines 33-34 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 22.

Regarding claim 23: Lin discloses plural halftone screen processings (figure 2(72,84) and column 7, lines 14-16 of Lin).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that the plural separate halftone screen processings comprise a halftone screen processing suitable for a text type image and a halftone screen processing suitable for a pictorial image.

Art Unit: 2624

Tai discloses that the plural separate halftone screen processings comprise a halftone screen processing suitable for a text type image (column 10, lines 60-63 of Tai) and a halftone screen processing suitable for a pictorial image (column 10, lines 64-67 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a halftone screen that is suitable for text and a halftone screen that is suitable for a pictorial image. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to process an image with multiple types of image regions (column 10, lines 57-60 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 23.

Regarding claim 24: Lin discloses plural halftone screen processings (figure 2(72,84) and column 7, lines 14-16 of Lin).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that the plural halftone screen processed gray level image data is blended according to blending coefficients.

Tai discloses that the plural halftone screen processed gray level image data is blended according to blending coefficients (column 10, lines 28-37 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to blend the plural halftone screens according to blending coefficients, as taught by Tai. The motivation for doing so

Art Unit: 2624

would have been to be able to render image regions where the contrast index is between the values given for the existing halftone screens (column 9, lines 39-45 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi to obtain the invention as specified in claim 24.

9. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (US Patent 5,742,703) in view of Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301), Tai (US Patent 5,694,224) and Mongeon (US Patent 5,710,824).

Regarding claim 16: Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that, prior to subjecting the RIP Data to plural separate halftone screen processing, the gray level image data is subject to processing for gray component replacement and undercolor removal.

Tai discloses subjecting the image data to plural separate halftone screen processing (column 8, line 56 to column 9, line 11 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to subject image data to plural separate halftone screen processing, as taught by Tai, said image data being the RIP Data taught by Lin in view of Yamaguchi. The motivation for doing so would have been to print halftone dots in a manner appropriate to the level of contrast of the data (column 8; lines 58-59, lines 62-63 and lines 65-66; and column 9, lines 9-10 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi.

Lin in view of Yamaguchi and Tai does not disclose expressly that the gray level image data is subject to processing for gray component replacement and undercolor removal.

Mongeon discloses subjecting color separation image data to processing for gray component replacement, referred to in Mongeon as "gray balance" and undercolor removal (column 2, lines 10-14 of Mongeon) prior to outputting to a device (figure 1(20→30); and column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 9 of Mongeon).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi and Tai is combinable with Mongeon are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the processing of image data for printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to perform gray component replacement and undercolor removal on the image data prior to plural halftone screen processing. The motivation for doing so would have been to adjust the color space so that the colors are calibrated for the desired output device (column 2, lines 1-9 of Mongeon). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mongeon with Lin in view of Yamaguchi and Tai to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Regarding claim 17: Lin discloses that the current pixel meeting the threshold criterion has its gray level value adjusted to a maximum value before being processed by gray level enhanced processing (column 7, lines 16-20 and lines 24-27 of Lin). When the current pixel is processed by channel A, the grayscale value of said current pixel is thresholded (column 7, lines 16-20 of Lin). Then, said current pixel saved as a single bit (column 7, lines 28-32 of Lin), which means that it is set to either on or off. Setting said current pixel to either on or

Art Unit: 2624

off essentially the same as setting an 8-bit grayscale value to either 0 or 255, especially since the single bit value determines whether the entire pixel is either all black or all white. Therefore, if the grayscale value of said current pixel is above the threshold value, then said current pixel is adjusted to the maximum value. The thresholding operation is performed prior to gray level enhancement processing (figure 2 (74,78) of Lin). In figure 2 of Lin, the binarization (figure 2 (72) of Lin) occurs before the pattern matching (figure 2(78) of Lin). The pattern matching block involves in part the rendering of grayscale or sub-pixel image signals, which is essentially gray level enhanced processing (column 7, lines 38-44 and column 8, lines 1-6 of Lin).

Regarding claim 18: Lin discloses that one of the screen processors has a screen frequency of at least 200 lines per inch (column 10, lines 38-45 of Lin).

10. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (US Patent 5,742,703) in view of Yamaguchi (US Patent 5,832,301) and Tai (US Patent 5,694,224) and in further view of *In re Dulberg* (289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961)).

Regarding claim 20: Lin discloses an apparatus for processing image data (figure 2 of Lin) comprising an input (figure 2(70) of Lin) to two image data processing devices (figure 2(72,84) of Lin) to input image data representing a current gray level pixel (column 7, lines 14-16 of Lin). One of said image data processing devices (figure 2(84) of Lin) is a halftone screen processing device (column 8, lines 25-27 of Lin).

Art Unit: 2624

Lin further discloses a detector (figure 2(78) of Lin) for examining the current pixel after image processing operations and neighboring pixels thereof after image processing operations (column 7, lines 40-46 of Lin) and determining if the current pixel and such neighboring pixels represent a substantially binary image file (column 7, lines 24-27 and lines 32-37 of Lin) and generating a signal (tag) relative to such determination (column 8, lines 18-20 of Lin).

Lin further discloses a selector (figure 2(88) of Lin), responsive to the signal (tag), that selects either the gray level image enhancement processing device output or a bypass representing a halftone data output (column 8, lines 42-47 of Lin).

Lin does not disclose expressly a raster image processor for providing rasterized color separated contone gray level image data (RIP Data); that said two image data processing devices are first and second halftone screen processing devices that form plural separate halftone processed screen gray level image data; a device for analyzing the current pixel for contrast index; a device responsive to the contrast index for generating blending coefficients; a blending operation processor that generates a blended halftone data output for the current pixel; an input at the blending operation processor for inputting respective outputs of the first and second halftone screen processing devices and the blending coefficients; and a gray level image enhancement processing device connected to the output of the blending operation processor.

Yamaguchi discloses a raster image processor (figure 6(700) of Yamaguchi) for providing rasterized color separated contone

Art Unit: 2624

gray level image data (RIP Data) (column 5, lines 11-20 of Yamaguchi).

Lin and Yamaguchi are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftoning and image processing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a raster image processor and thus provide rasterized color separated gray level image data. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to perform real-time layout editing of printer output data (column 5, lines 20-22 of Yamaguchi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Yamaguchi with Lin.

Lin in view of Yamaguchi does not disclose expressly that said two image data processing devices are first and second halftone screen processing devices that form plural separate halftone processed screen gray level image data; a device for analyzing the current pixel for contrast index; a device responsive to the contrast index for generating blending coefficients; a blending operation processor that generates a blended halftone data output for the current pixel; an input at the blending operation processor for inputting respective outputs of the first and second halftone screen processing devices and the blending coefficients; and a gray level image enhancement processing device connected to the output of the blending operation processor.

Tai discloses first (figure 10a of Tai) and second halftone screens (figure 11 of Tai) that form plural separate halftone processed screen gray level image data from said RIP Data (column 8, lines 56-63 of Tai); and a device (figure 6(150) and column 7, lines 42-43 of Tai) for analyzing a current pixel for contrast index (column 9, lines 12-19 of Tai) and that is

Art Unit: 2624

responsive to the contrast index for generating blending coefficients (column 10, lines 28-37 of Tai). The blending screen logic control device (figure 6(150) of Tai) analyzes each pixel and a corresponding neighborhood for contrast (column 9, lines 12-19 of Tai) and calculates a contrast index (column 9, lines 39-45 of Tai). Said blending screen logic control further generates blending coefficients based on said contrast index (column 10, lines 28-37 of Tai).

Tai further discloses a blending operation processor (figure 6(160) of Tai) that generates a blended halftone data output for the current pixel (column 7, lines 37-40 and lines 61-67 of Tai); and an input (figure 6(150→160) of Tai) at said blending operation processor for inputting respective outputs of the first and second halftone screens and the blending coefficients. As can be seen from figure 6 of Tai, the outputs of the blending screen logic control (figure 6(150) of Tai) are input to the blending operation processor (figure 6(160) of Tai). The outputs relating to the first and second halftone screens and blending coefficients are input to said blending operation processor for rendering and outputting (column 7, lines 37-40 of Tai).

Tai further discloses a gray level image enhancement processing device (figure 18(340) of Tai). The gray scale image mapper and tone adjustment device (figure 18(340) of Tai) enhances the gray level image data so that said image data can be tone adjusted (column 14, lines 23-31 of Tai) and displayed using a higher number of bits (column 14, lines 17-23 of Tai).

Lin in view of Yamaguchi is combinable with Tai because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely halftone printing and image processing. At the time of the invention, it

Art Unit: 2624

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a first halftone screen processing device in place of the binarizer (figure 2(72) of Lin) and a second halftone screen for the halftone screen processing device (figure 2(84) of Lin); include the blending screen logic control device (figure 6(150) of Tai), as taught by Tai, after the halftone screen processing devices, as taught by Lin; include the blending operation processor (figure 6(160) of Tai) that generates a blended halftone data output, as taught by Tai, after said blending screen logic control; and include an input (figure 6(150→160) of Tai) for inputting the outputs of the first and second halftone screen processing devices and the blending coefficients into said unified rendering device. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to process an image with multiple types of image regions (column 10, lines 57-60 of Tai). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a gray level enhancement processing device (figure 18(340) of Tai), as taught by Tai, connected to the output of said blending operation processor. The motivation for doing so would have been to adjust the image data so that the proper tone is displayed and for the proper bit-depth (column 14, lines 14-17 of Tai). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tai with Lin in view of Yamaguchi.

Lin in view of Tai does not disclose expressly that the device for analyzing the current pixel for contrast index and the device responsive to the contrast index are separate devices. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to split the blending screen logic control device (figure 6(150) of Tai) into

Art Unit: 2624

the two separate aforementioned devices and perform the functions of said blending screen logic control device as two separate devices since *In re Dulberg* has held that making elements separable is an obvious design choice if there is no unexpected result occurring from the separation that distinguishes over the prior art.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2624

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

JAT
09 June 2005



Thomas D.
~~LEE~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER